

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit	: 1791	Customer No. 035811
Examiner	: Erin Lynn Snelting	
Serial No.	: 10/530,263	Docket No.: BAN-05-1080
Filed	: April 5, 2005	
Inventors	: Toshihide Sekido	
	: Kazuaki Kitaoka	Confirmation No.: 4698
	: Hiroshi Odani	
	: Shigeru Nishiyama	
	: Masahiko Shimizu	
Title	: METHOD OF RTM MOLDING	
		Dated: August 11, 2009

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated July 24, 2009.

This Response is submitted with an additional one month extension of time and a Request for Continued Examination wherein the RCE requests that the changes to the claims set forth in the Applicants' Response dated July 16, 2009 be entered into the official file.

Inasmuch as Claim 16 has been amended and those changes now been entered into the official file, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are allowable over the prior art rejections. In that regard, it should be noted that the subject matter of independent Claim 16 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by any of the prior art of record, whether taken individually or collectively.

There is no disclosure in the art of:

(1) Positively continuing evacuation of resin from inside of the laminate;

(2) Remarkable advantages are obtained wherein a stable molded material with little dispersion of the fiber volume content over the entirety of the molded material can be obtained.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments in the Advisory Action with respect to the combination of US '537 and WO '392. The Applicants fully appreciate the Examiner's point with respect to the fact that US '537, not WO '392 is being relied upon to teach the claim method steps as in Claim 16. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that they have already demonstrated that US '537 does not disclose the method of Claim 16. In particular, US' 537 does not disclose, teach or suggest positively injecting the resin, controlling the evacuation line and stopping evacuation before curing of the resin before stabilizing the volume fiber content. Thus, the Applicants point is that even if one skilled in the art looks to WO '392 and hypothetically combines any of the WO '392 disclosure with US '537, the result of that combination will still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a method which positively injects the resin, controls the evacuation line and stops the evacuation before curing of the resin to stabilize the fiber volume content. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination is inapplicable to Claim 16 as recited in the rejection.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully respected.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vp
(215) 656-3381